UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,054	06/25/2003	Munisamy Prabu	MS1-1465US	4124

69316   7590   12/09/2008
MICROSOFT CORPORATION
ONE MICROSOFT WAY
REDMOND, WA 98052

EXAMINER
LIN, SHEW FEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2166	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/607,054	PRABU ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SHEW-FEN LIN	2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 August 2008*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-43* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-43* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *11/7/08*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

a. This action is taken to response to Request for Continued Examination filed on 8/26/2008.

b. Claims 1-43 are pending. Claims 1, 13, 22, 27, 36, and 39 are independent claims.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 26, 2008 has been entered.

Response to Remarks

Applicant's amendments and remarks have been fully and carefully considered. In view of applicant statement on pages 9-10 of remarks that exhibits do not appear to have been disclosed to public as " the exhibits have a copyright date of 2001, … because Exhibits 3 and 4 clearly state *"Microsoft Confidential.* © 2001 Microsoft Corporation...*FOR DISCLOSURE UNDER NDA ONLY."* Accordingly, these exhibits do not appear to have been disclosed to the public in 2001. Just because a document has a copyright date, does not mean that the document was publicly disclosed on the date appearing in the notice. In this case, these exhibits appear to have been kept *confidential* within Microsoft...", thereby, the rejection based on prior art "ADS

("Image-based Installation of the Operating System and the Cluster Service Using Automated

Deployment Services (ADS)", January 1, 2003, Microsoft TechNet,

http://technet2.microsoft.com/WindowsServer/en/library/ba672f36-2a9d-43d2-9737-

ab50d5b8b71b1033.mspx?mfr=true" is withdrawn. Upon further search and consideration, a

new ground of rejection is set forth as below.

Claim Objections

Claim 2, line 1, recite "A..." it is suggested to change it to "The" as all dependent claims

should begin with "The" as oppose to "A" or "An" to clarify its dependencies on prior claimed

subject matter. Claims 3-12, 23-26, 37-38, and 40-43 contain similar problems and thus rejected

under the same reasoning.

Claim 14, line 1, recite "One or more..." it is suggested to change it to "The one or more"

as all dependent claims should begin with "The" to clarify its dependencies on prior claimed

subject matter. Claims 15-21 and 28-35 contain similar problems and thus rejected under the

same reasoning.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or
> any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and
> requirements of this title.

Claims 1-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed

to non-statutory subject matter.

A claim that requires one or more acts to be performed defines a process. However, not all processes are statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101. Schrader, 22 F.3d at 296, 30 USPQ2d at 1460. To be statutory, a claimed computer-related process must either: (A) result in a physical transformation outside the computer for which a practical application is either disclosed in the specification or would have been known to a skilled artisan, or (B) be limited to a practical application. See **MPEP 2106 IV.B.2.(b)**. Furthermore, In re Bilski, Appeal No. 2007-1130, a § 101 process must (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. If neither of these requirements is met by the claim, the method is not a patent eligible process under § 101 and should be rejected as being directed to nonstatutory subject matter.

Claims 1 and 22 are directed towards carrying job sequence. However, the claim fails to produce an output or store a result and therefore fails to produce a tangible result. In order for the subject matter to be considered statutory, it must produce a useful, concrete and tangible result.

Claims 2-12 and 23-26 depend from rejected claims 1 and 22 respectively, comprise the same deficiencies as those claims directly or indirectly by dependence, and are therefore rejected on the same basis.

With regard to claims 13 and 27, the claim fails to place the invention squarely within one statutory class of invention. In page 117, lines 19-21 of the instant specification, applicant has provided evidence that applicant intends the "medium" to include signals by the use of the word "communications media," and Communication media" includes data <u>signal</u>, such as <u>carrier wave</u> (page 118, lines 6-8). As such, the claim is drawn to a form of energy. Energy is not one of the four categories of invention and therefore this claim is not statutory. Energy is not a series

of steps or acts and thus is not a process. Energy is not a physical article or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. Energy is not a combination of substances and therefore not a composition of matter.

Claims 14-21 and 28-35 depend from rejected claims 13 and 27 respectively, comprise the same deficiencies as those claims directly or indirectly by dependence, and are therefore rejected on the same basis.

With regard to claim 36, applicant claims several "means for" limitations, which in view of the specification may all be implemented in software. Thus claim is software per se. The claims lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101.

Claims 37-38 depend from rejected claim 36, comprise the same deficiencies as those claims directly or indirectly by dependence, and are therefore rejected on the same basis.

Claim 39 recites a system, however, the use of various components and elements that would be reasonably understood by one of ordinary skill in the art to mean software, software based component implementation, or an abstract concept based on software. Examples of components and concepts used in the claim are: "a controller", "a network boot service", and other such terms that are interpreted to mean abstract concepts and software implementations. There are no definitive hardware or physical components associated with these examples in the claims or in the specification. The claims lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101.

Claims 40-43 depend from rejected claim 39, comprise the same deficiencies as those claims directly or indirectly by dependence, and are therefore rejected on the same basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim element "obtaining.., generting..., carrying..." is a means (or step) plus function limitation that invokes 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. However, the written description fails to disclose the corresponding structure, material, or acts for the claimed function.

Applicant is required to:

(a) Amend the claim so that the claim limitation will no longer be a means (or step) plus function limitation under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph; or

(b) Amend the written description of the specification such that it expressly recites what structure, material, or acts perform the claimed function without introducing any new matter (35 U.S.C. 132(a)).

If applicant is of the opinion that the written description of the specification already implicitly or inherently discloses the corresponding structure, material, or acts so that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize what structure, material, or acts perform the claimed function, applicant is required to clarify the record by either:

(a) Amending the written description of the specification such that it expressly recites the corresponding structure, material, or acts for performing the claimed function and clearly links or

associates the structure, material, or acts to the claimed function, without introducing any new

matter (35 U.S.C. 132(a)); or

(b) Stating on the record what the corresponding structure, material, or acts, which are

implicitly or inherently set forth in the written description of the specification, perform the

claimed function. For more information, see 37 CFR 1.75(d) and MPEP §§ 608.01(o) and 2181.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 3, 6-13, 16-22, 24-30, 32-36, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by Maddocks et al. (US Patent 7367017, hereinafter Maddocks).

As to claim 1, Maddocks discloses a method, implemented in a device (Fig. 1), the

method comprising:

obtaining a task sequence that describes a set of one or more steps to be carried out in

managing another device (Figs. 2-3, col. 2, lines 43-45, lines 56-67, col. 3, lines 11-19, line 33

to col. 4, line 53, configuring a device, adding/altering a command of a particular sequence, or

executing one or more machine control sequences);

generating a job tree representing the set of one or more steps (Figs. 2-3, col. 3, lines 56-

67, col. 3, line 33 to col. 4, line 53, The Jtree 36 is a <u>hierarchical tree structure of sequences,</u>

steps, devices and commands, with the sequence being at the root of the tree structure); and

carrying out the set of one or more steps in accordance with the job tree (Fig. 3, 31, col.

5, lines 18-32, run sequence).

As to Claim 3, Maddocks disclose the method as recited in claim 1, wherein carrying out

the set of one or more steps comprises: carrying out a first step of the set of one or more steps

(Figs. 2-3, step 1, step 2,..); and carrying out the remaining steps of the set of one or more steps

only if the first step is completed successfully (Fig. 3, steps 2-3, Wait for drives to be ready).

As to Claim 6, Maddocks discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein one of the

steps comprises another task sequence (Fig. 3).

As to claim 7, Maddocks discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein one of the

steps comprises an operation to be performed (Figs. 2-3, steps correspond to various operations

performed by the AutoChanger in conjunction with the drives, such as loading and unloading

particular tapes onto and from the drives).

As to claim 8, Maddocks discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the job tree comprises a parent node (Fig. 2, 37) corresponding to the job and one or more child nodes (Fig. 2, 39), wherein each child node corresponds to one of the one or more steps (Figs. 2-3, step 1 corresponds to the child of sequence name 37).

As to claim 9, Maddocks discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the set of one or more steps described in the task sequence are to be carried out in managing a plurality of other devices concurrently (Fig. 2, device 1, device 2).

As to claim 10, Maddocks discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the task sequence comprises a user-defined task sequence (Fig. 3, col. 3, lines 11-19).

As to claim 11, Maddocks discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the task sequence comprises a user-selected task sequence (Fig. 3, col. 3, lines 11-19, 49, selected by the user).

As to claim 12, Maddocks discloses the method as recited in claim 1, further comprising recording the set of one or more steps in a log (Fig. 6, col. 1, lines 29-31, col. 5, lines 24-26).

As to claim 13, is directed to a computer readable medium carrying instructions for performing the methods of claim 1 therefore rejected along the same rationale.

As to claim 16, is directed to a computer readable medium carrying instructions for performing the methods of claim 3 therefore rejected along the same rationale.

As to claim 17, is directed to a computer readable medium carrying instructions for performing the methods of claim 6 therefore rejected along the same rationale.

As to claim 18, is directed to a computer readable medium carrying instructions for performing the methods of claim 7 therefore rejected along the same rationale.

As to claim 19, is directed to a computer readable medium carrying instructions for performing the methods of claim 9 therefore rejected along the same rationale.

As to claim 20, is directed to a computer readable medium carrying instructions for performing the methods of claim 8 therefore rejected along the same rationale.

As to claim 21, is directed to a computer readable medium carrying instructions for performing the methods of claim 12 therefore rejected along the same rationale.

As to claim 22, Maddocks discloses a method, implemented in a device (server, page 1, paragraph 2), the method comprising:

obtaining a user-defined task sequence that describes an action to be carried out in managing another device (Figs. 2-3, col. 2, lines 43-45, lines 56-67, col. 3, lines 11-19, line 33 to col. 4, line 53, configuring a device, adding/altering a command of a particular sequence, or executing one or more machine control sequences);

converting the user-defined task sequence to a set of one or more steps of a job to be carried out in managing the other device (Figs. 2-3, col. 3, lines 56-67, col. 3, line 33 to col. 4,

line 53, create sequence as a hierarchical tree structure of sequences, steps, devices and

commands, with the sequence being at the root of the tree structure); and

carrying out the one or more steps of the job (Fig. 3, 31, col. 5, lines 18-32, run

sequence).

As to claim 24, has the same subject matter as of claim 3 and as such rejected under the

same rationale.

As to claim 25, has the same subject matter as of claim 9 and as such rejected under the

same rationale.

As to claim 26, has the same subject matter as of claim 8 and as such rejected under the

same rationale.

As to claim 27, is directed to a computer readable medium carrying instructions for

performing the methods of claim 1 therefore rejected along the same rationale.

As to claim 28, is directed to a computer readable medium carrying instructions for

performing the methods of claim 10 therefore rejected along the same rationale.

As to claim 29, Maddocks discloses the one or more computer readable media as recited

in claim 27, wherein the job representation comprises a tree having a plurality of nodes (Fig. 2),

wherein each of the one or more elements for each step is represented by one of the plurality of

nodes (Figs. 2-3).

As to claim 30, Maddocks discloses the one or more computer readable media as recited in claim 29, wherein the job representation includes a one to one corresponding of elements to steps (Figs. 2-3).

As to claim 32, is directed to a computer readable medium carrying instructions for performing the methods of claim 3 therefore rejected along the same rationale.

As to claim 33, is directed to a computer readable medium carrying instructions for performing the methods of claim 6 therefore rejected along the same rationale.

As to claim 34, is directed to a computer readable medium carrying instructions for performing the methods of claim 7 therefore rejected along the same rationale.

As to claim 35, is directed to a computer readable medium carrying instructions for performing the methods of claim 9 therefore rejected along the same rationale.

As to claim 36, is directed to a system claim carrying instructions for performing the methods of claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.

As to claim 38, is directed to a system claim carrying instructions for performing the methods of claim 9 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c)

and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 2, 5, 14-15, 23, 31, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Maddocks in view of Hsieh et al. (US Patent Publication 2002/0191014)

As to claim 2, Maddocks discloses the method as recited in claim 1, but does not

explicitly disclose wherein the set of one or more steps includes steps for automatically

deploying an operating system on the other device.

Hsieh discloses automatically deploying an operating system on the other device (Fig. 7,

abstract, graphical user interfaces according to the present invention provide techniques for rapid

and repeatable <u>installation and updating of operating system,</u> application and customer software).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to

modify the teachings of Maddocks with the teachings Hsieh to load an operating system on

device as well as other software application.

As to claim 5, Maddocks discloses the method as recited in claim 1, but does not explicitly disclose wherein the task sequence is part of an Extensible Markup Language (XML) file.

Hsieh discloses the task sequence is part of an Extensible Markup Language (XML) file (paragraph 0044, The user interface 40 communicates with the gateway 38, which converts messages into the appropriate format. For instance, the gateway can convert SQL data messages from the database 32 into an XML (Extensible Markup Language) format which the user interface 40 then processes into a presentation format for display to the user).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Maddocks with the teachings Hsieh to communicate with device using XML format.

As to claim 14, is directed to a computer readable medium carrying instructions for performing the methods of claim 5 therefore rejected along the same rationale.

As to claim 15, is directed to a computer readable medium carrying instructions for performing the methods of claim 2 therefore rejected along the same rationale.

As to claim 23, has the same subject matter as of claim 2 and as such rejected under the same rationale.

As to claim 31, is directed to a computer readable medium carrying instructions for performing the methods of claim 2 therefore rejected along the same rationale.

As to claim 37, is directed to a system claim carrying instructions for performing the methods of claim 2 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maddocks in view

of Mahmoud (US Patent 7,234,053).

As to claim 4, Maddocks discloses the method as recited in claim 1, but does not

explicitly disclose wherein carrying out the set of one or more steps causes the device to have

firmware on the other device configured and an operating system to be deployed on the other

device.

Mahmoud discloses the device to have firmware on the other device configured and an

operating system to be deployed on the other device (Figs. 3-4, col. 7, lines 14-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to

modify the teachings of Maddocks with the teachings Mahmoud to load the information from

BIOS to install operating system .

Claims 39-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maddocks

in view of Fulginiti et al. (US Patent publication 2003/0120827, hereinafter Fulginiti).

As to claim 39, Maddocks discloses a system comprising:

a controller to obtain a task sequence that describes one or more steps to be performed on

a remote device (Figs. 2-3, col. 2, lines 43-45, lines 56-67, col. 3, lines 11-19, line 33 to col. 4,

line 53, configuring a device, adding/altering a command of a particular sequence, or executing

one or more machine control sequences), and to generate a job representation of the one or more

steps (Figs. 2-3, col. 3, lines 56-67, col. 3, line 33 to col. 4, line 53, The Jtree 36 is a <u>hierarchical</u>

<u>tree structure of sequences</u>, steps, devices and commands, with the sequence being at the root of

the tree structure);

but does not explicitly discloses a network boot service to detect when the remote device

is coupled to a network that the system is also coupled to, and to communicate with the

controller to determine which of the steps of the job representation are to be carried out in

response to the detection .

Fulginiti discloses a network boot service to detect when the remote device is coupled to

a network that the system is also coupled to, and to communicate with the controller to determine

which of the steps of the job representation are to be carried out in response to the detection

(Figs. 2-6, abstract, An indication from a device is received through a network. Upon a

determination from the indication that the device is in a state in which a first system has not been

loaded on the device, the device is instructed through the network to load the first system. Upon

receiving through the network from the device an indication that the first system has been

loaded, it is indicated through a (possibly remote) user interface that the device is in an

"available" state in which the device is available to load an operating system selectable through

the user interface)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to

modify the teachings of Maddocks with the teachings Fulginiti to include detecting machine

states during an operating system installation through a network for automating the installation

process (paragraph 0003, Fulginiti).

As to claim 40, Fulginiti discloses the system as recited in claim 39, wherein the one or more steps includes steps for automatically deploying an operating system on the remote device (Fig. 6, abstract).

As to claim 41, Maddocks discloses the system as recited in claim 39, wherein one of the steps comprises another task sequence (Fig. 3).

As to claim 42, Maddocks discloses the system as recited in claim 39, wherein one of the steps comprises an operation to be performed on the remote device (install operating system via network, page 1, paragraph 2).

As to claim 43, Maddocks discloses the system as recited in claim 39, wherein the job representation comprises a tree having a plurality of nodes (Fig. 2), wherein each of the one or more elements for each step is represented by one of the plurality of nodes (Figs. 2-3).

Related Prior Arts

The following list of prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Maddux, Alvin et al., US 20020124245 A1, "Method and apparatus for advanced software deployment".

- Ottman; Tadd V. et al., US 5142680 A, "Method for loading an operating system through a network".

- Tezuka; Satoru et al., US 5845078 A, "Network integrated construction system, method of installing network connection machines, and method of setting network parameters".

- Imai; Tsuneo et al., US 5978590 A, "Installation system".

- Gross; Danny B. et al., US 6128734 A, "Installing operating systems changes on a computer system".

- Dean; Jeffrey Randell et al., US 6202206 B1, "Simultaneous installation and configuration of programs and components into a network of server and client computers".

- Cheng; William et al., US 6457076 B1, "System and method for modifying software residing on a client computer that has access to a network".

- Anderson; Eric C. et al., US 6578142 B1, "Method and apparatus for automatically installing and configuring software on a computer".

- Keller; Alexander et al., US 6847970 B2, "Methods and apparatus for managing dependencies in distributed systems"

- Murphy; Richard C. et al., US 7152157 B2, "System and method for dynamic resource configuration using a dependency graph".

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shew-Fen Lin whose telephone number is 571-272-2672. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Shew-Fen Lin /S. L./
Examiner, Art Unit 2166
December 5, 2008

/Khanh B. Pham/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2166